

9-5-07 Wed

How stop crimes
being getting gone?

McN: vs. NNWS
vs. NWS

Pres of US \approx Pres of NRA
wrt news

in charge of
"gen control"

involvement in NFU, but can't say.

Aug of 4

NATO

~~Boys~~ 1978 - Vance

but: departure: after Vance

after GW/NATO

as before, in TW
ME

(Patterson?)

US Ambition: right up to ^{NWS}SU border

China
NWS

(his Pol v. India?)

several thats

modern modern
(Strat Comm)

US still:

whole world ME (v. long after
now?)

(v. Russia, in Coast, Central Asia?)

We want, for global peace: oil

(and new EU)

("reforming":

small warps?

(as if old warps
didn't make for peace?)

Hatched: one war 1) more than that

(hyp) GW doesn't come. 2) more credible thats

don't back down?

(attenuate, wf on them?)

+ does want new attacks, not only in [will that help
regain peace?]?

9-8-07

Puzzle: How can we stop prolif (+ back to
nuc. attacks terror

while FU (no NEU)
arsenals (+ modernization) MoN
you can't

Present to disoriented: bst 1950
1946

the

Nixon '85

(Nixon in '69)

The same motives that block NEU for Pres (Kerry)
or candidate

(all these
candidates!)

lead to threats
ad to poss. of carrying the art

imperial objectives
deployments of US as tripartite
desires deployments that demand "we defend"
ambitious goals, from from home

we fight abroad — not to avoid being to
fight at home (or be occupied)
WWI?

(starting with American Wars
and Mexican War

(all since 1783, 1812?)

Phil/Cuba

("rather fight than") + long

There's no danger of that,

(for foreigners — and for
domestic enemies of Carrot

(not - William Pitt - Tories)

— but to have dominion abroad

(My friend relatives were not
at risk — they left, came home!) of US Corps and this how

9-8-07

Wed at 6 PM:

- MGE fix Appendix

(+ guests?)

- get: Dns/Refers on wires/then
NFCU

(~~they~~ want go for NFCU
2007

(us. Voner)

new Cont Doctrine - no invite, unfriendly
(FCU ^{urgent} the breach of SC (not "pro-US" pro-Israel)

Now, why?!

(stakeholder, inquiries:

the Doctrine)

Niran
Hollander

- meeting by Bernheim / NAPP

To Hirsch: we reason why I'm "helping
the way" - ^{even} for NFCU,

not, now, breach

not Voner(?)

I'm "endorsing" FCU thanks
efficiency of

NFCU no. NNWS

(WMDs?)

"Anyone who into

going for wires?)

did what I think about"

is a traitor, helping wrong: George W

(WRP etc in neo-cons

(opposite of Israel: Ching?)

What are I saying - about presidents ("all")
(not, party, personality -
or ~~their~~ attitudes about moves:
E.

(What is McD saying about
attitudes of: allies
Congress
Public
(vs. them, his)?

- about chance of war over?
^{we've been}
(clear than I thought!
(+ see C-II)

- reasons for escalation + FS powers?
(not only, "2d-strike" D-L
or, preemption

(We are going to test for stems
on Type 5 Out of SU - by ^{"limited"} ~~hard~~ are
attacks on SU or its allies' powers! (and pop!)

Yok I has to be strong (By: vs. Russians
Deep/CP!

not yet any (he about to) fail: ^{vs. SU wild power}
to, D-L

Vs. ^{AW} "Debate" Bolshoi: San's my out of
he 1) ambitious to rule world (NO)
+ tolerant of sov can (NO)
or (2) fearful of US/NATO FS
(esp. if the stems us of
attacks Europe)

or, balance alone, UA, Latin-regions

but to the my joint have experienced US LW NUCS
(and opposite see, like McD or IKE)

Now, what?

Wolf/Chung/Rumfeld: "Don't let any state think it could
1992 deter us from using nukes"

(see Wolf, 1977,
1979)

(Carter Doctrine)
on MB

(ASW interest = PG: (incl ABM)

Was Wolf. involved in "Dissociate Deterrence"?

[What if: A bomb't been thrown into VN policy,
& McNamara's JTM?! Would I have been
with them?

What were Wolf. + Paul doing in 1964-69?
ASW hsr

(Would I have been Dep. Asst. Sec., like
Wolf. in 1977? (under Carter)
(I didn't want to be)

Is there, should there be, a nuclear option?

(Atkins, UK, Euro actual as if not, in
1950 (hst) or 1954 (DBP).

("except for NATO - when they moved it!"
to some major
superior interest

(not for pumping)

BUT NOW?!

Do we need it? Necessity?

If so (then, US policy as one
but + still have
been it? What would

Dems, moderates, do?

(Bush I? He did threaten!

I like it, Bush I
+ I can't get don't
believe in Wolf. 1992
electronic?

① Do Dems believe in Vance Doctrine?

not HRC now?
or Edwards, Obama

(Clinton vs. Helms, WMO
unilateral
Center - profit

Clinton: don't fight MIC?

or, don't let them believe until MIC?
again

Which Pres. have

"considered" "nuclear option" in a crisis?
FU

perhaps not Reagan!
(Ford?)

best (bluff - Berlin?) (on Korea? JCS agent, ~50? ~52?

the (vs. Ambrose)

JFK (bluff?)

LBJ (subtly) (would he?)

N (vs. Beltr?)

Clinton: for, 'year'

August 1980

C. backed off!

all, NATO

and ME! (beant)
from (worth?)

or proportional S.A.

Book I?

(if SA had

really tried

to take S.A. —

did Bush

"consider" now?!

that SU "back off" in

Ag '80 because of the

new threats (Pent, Clinton)

or because of the Center

backed off (from raid

as N backed off Dark Noak)

not F?

not R?
not F

not R?

True Option (FU) has always been regarded
as available and, in a crisis, necessary
in ME — as well as in Europe

(TR: Blackout in June '46?

and now applies to local ~~power~~ unfriendly
power (Iran, Iraq... Syria?)
if 1) WMD program, or use

TR

2) ~~strategic~~ ^{SL} prog vs. Saudis? (in 1990?)

How could we
have prevented it —

if NSC believed what
they said? (Did they?)

What is Southwest Asia?
"SU could overrun."

Always, if SU threatens north Iran:

Oct 46

(RAND, late '50's)

Wolfe, 1977, 1979

Center 1980: from
August
Rogers 1981 "if"...

but; CW arm in Europe

No SU — or Russia? — threat to ME (even if we
collect, now?)
(was there ever? this then?)
(expectations of US FU?)

or if SU proposes to intervene in Egypt/Iran

1956 (Nixon says)

So — only FU?

1973

nationale for FU: underground WMD Iran, Iraq
(actual reason?)

or, from use of
WMD vs. Israel
if US or Israel are attacked

FU threat to
NYP: DETER/
PREVENT IRAX
WMD (gas, BW?)

IF US INVADES (prospect
for 2003-04?)
(as, Iraq)
LATER? (Israel)

(What if Paks fights India —
with arms?)

WHO DOES WHAT?

Wesley

9-7-7

If there had been no US Troops in West
Berlin — no tripwire (see R on Persian Gulf)

the SU could just have moved in, not
blockaded. (like VFR in Cuba — facing SU troops
(+ missiles))

(see my "Tang Intell. Detector" 1959)

But if they besieged Berlin

US troops are in division size (or, "gung")

could be surrounded overwhelmingly

(How could SU pressure an enclave — Cuba —
in Caribbean?!

Any the way he tried!

and if he could have delayed an attack
till the war started

(no U-2 — weather

or, detection (he hoped)

or if he announced warheads

and travel with Turkey was not acceptable

to K, or Turkey/NATO, or JFK

It'd still be there — like Berlin

(+ South Korea?!) ^{West}

The way ~~was~~ ^{was} don't have (and SVN 1956-64)

north from [OIL then?!]

(1980?)

In CW:

FU that was rationalized by overvaluing
SU cap - facing What for & exp. Berlin
None

But now? Recently, it was ^{substant} always there
was SU in Iran, PG 1980

None, too!

Recently, it was ^{also} used vs. Kuwait vs. QUOTE
by."

(not vs. Iran in 1980-86, or Iraq:
BUT WMD, yes! We helped,
gone!

What if we had been
needed - by either?!
Would we have allowed either
to conquer & occupy the other?!

NO

Spent, then, because (2) oil was spent huge,
cost
goal
of US
as cover bulli

6) public/allowed fear of till 1980 (still
CW!)
SU response ^{lower than public target}
(USG thought that was low - and
wanted to keep it low

- but to oversee a non-zero
risk that public would act.

(also, the valued people,
or cost of back-down,
more than public, allow

Now, no fear of Russians. (US central
of oil!)
(will Putin try to be more "unpredictable"?
or, of them!
(Or will we
"propagate," from US...)

In Cuban Crisis, 1971 — who detained who?

- In deciding not to go to England, 1971 — " " "

- In great Ag crisis in 1980 " " "

(from 54/Centre)

(see Jack Anderson, book)

"Wf many now?"

see: "no more
9-11's!"

No weapons have exploded for 62 years —
though there have been many threats like this!

(true of

my long list underscores this point!

Ans: Because we should have warned them!

This threat is not less dangerous than those: (if/when we know)

and many of those threats were dangerous. Guaranteed — we're
being very lucky (Not very likely that all efforts

were back off, in time

(while SH in 1991

SH in 2002

K just would it!

FU is not a legit option

any more than a threat to kill

hostages: e.g. trains in US! POWs!

(It is a threat to kill hostages, in fact!

"Inevitably — but miserably, inevitably,
ruthlessly

(perhaps, eventually, maximizing

"collateral" / bonus damage

(like train in Karlsruhe?)

gas chambers —

Porture of known innocents — relatives of "suspect"
(to you, etc.: Wf not?)

9-7-7

[We must be as behind timid as China!

and as: DOJ, OOB, CIA, etc.

see story today: "We're one
(known) bomb away" —

(JFK/RFK vs. Castro

from an planned police state.

PDS: Suppose we did disarm: — Wb killed JFK

— China did 9-11 (but learned
after he was sent of
office)

Cent. Wf wrong?

(The big roots of present war crisis:
Wf are shared wrong-
and act!

not a bluff - now, even all

War is not certain - still less, ^{earlier...} less.

JCS/State/Rice very frail

of any sort (as in Cambodia, 1970, US troops!

me "How is it possible that after ^{more than} 50 years (52?)
of anti-war agitation, action, execution, ^{Russell-Evitts}
1955?
52 years
1954-1955
Dawson,
Committee
(H)

see March Proposal

"We see Dem/Rep against that FU
is a legit after - in a dispute with a

non-suspension (yet-) NWS? [cf. China, ...]
with no suspension ^{with} change? ^{note, Pak (Korea, then similar!)}
Why not (more) change?

as in VN: Need to understand as well as ^{to} oppose + resist.
and more, 1986
21 yrs

+ believe, for a long time, that both our central
advisers, scholars of our war, + anti-war activists
have lacked an adequate understanding of the
motives, ^{intent} and dynamics of the war and build-up
+ its resolution. + I believe they have failed
to integrate into their thinking + action
the degree to which, and how and why,
warfare weapons are integrated into foreign
policy. [Atomic Diplomacy!]

The First Use was not in
August '45 but is prob. at Potsdam!

but ~~it~~ is the importance that FU threats
and ~~is~~ parts of TW
quite regional adversaries -

~~Assess~~ have been going by USG leaders & elites
Assess in the minds

and how FS caps. have been shaped
largely to question & reduce the cred. of
FU threats.

Wf the need for FU threats? To look further
to the perennial crisis - the "need" for
distance interventions, where US troops
might or do encounter superior ground
forces

Stage:

gunnies!

but, "supported from outside," with "Austrian"

The lack of any explosions/attacks is enough
need to mean that US threats were all bluffs,
or "unneeded" (no offensive crisis &
no, alternative means

(there is some cases;

but in some: - no perennial attacked

- they were not bluffs

- either need was enough perennial,
or suggested

Elites/Congress

endorse crisis, values,

goals; and are means

or the unneeded

(as pres' belief -

major war after the
rejection)

so they relied again, and
maintained caps by successors...
(and demanded
the successors do so)

17/11/84

The key is the importance that FCU threats
- both quiet SU and $\frac{1}{2}$ parts of TW
quite regional advances -

~~Business~~ ~~have~~ ~~long~~ ~~given~~ by USG leaders & elites
assumed in the minds

and how FS corps. have been shaped
largely to question & reduce the cred. of
FCU threats.

Why the need for FCU threats? Go back further
to the imperial axis: the "need" for
distinct intermediaries, where US troops
might or do encounter superior ground
forces

though:
questionable!

but, "supported from outside," with "Austrian"

The lack of any explosions/attacks is enough
need to warn that US threats were all bluffs,
or "unneeded" (no offensive axis &
or, alternative means

(there is some cases;

but in some: - no perceived attempt

- to use not bluffs

- little need was enough perceived,
or exaggerated

Elites/Conquerors

endorse axis, values,

goals; and more means

by the unneeded

(as pres' believed -

maybe more often the
realistic)

so the belief again, and
maintained cost ^{by successive...} (and demanded
the successor do so)

It is a mistake to believe that all presidents
(e.g., Ike, N, Ford, G.W.B.) have the ^{same} absence
of "use attacks/~~wars~~ as we war
that the non-elite public does ("use")

2) or to believe that those who do ^{or not?} abhor it (1st after ~~the~~ ⁴⁹ ~~the~~ ^{or not?})

JFK, LBJ; Center? Reagan!

6HwB?

will not take significant notes of it
(Even the public thinks ^{notes} ~~it~~ are
higher than " would scraps)

in "Crimson"

- partly defined by internal values + goals + fears

"the public" here means not-imperial public

Pres. many came from riparian class, and/o,
one advocated to be, and compete to be,
riparian managers

Once in, they are constrained (by Cap, allies, elites, officials, mil...) to serve informal values, which may, in crisis situations, "argue" EU threats / risks / gambles.

on sum, EV

Have reluctant the one with to use the
means of to secure these values, ends (over the
the day, in office)

If born to be "a (Queen's) woman"

64WB / J. B. T. B.

Emphreus

not just a King
dictator

but value of an
(expanding, or needing)

En Ami (3 pages)

9-7-7

They have all threatened, because they felt they
needed to, in situations that arose - in nearly any form:

(perhaps, undesired, unforeseen
- an of adversity)

9 (of 10) is crises;

all confined standing threats - Ecu

- PB after 1980

(recently, before:
mil. plans)

stake - ^{Korea} VN
(Hollow Gull)
surrounded DBP, Choin;
Ker Gull [Berlin]
most after, SEA
ME

- vs. Chinese assault

(as lost in 1952
Hanson)

(not, Ecu)

not, "preventive," non-crises:

and facing immediate challenge,
danger

at least 2, very reluctant - yet...

(LBJ ignores the, 1965) (now, Set)
JFK

Would LBJ have let Manning be captured?

Would JFK have "ignored" FRONGS on Manning?

(Would the four let Quang be starved,
(China's army) or taken?

Berlin? (1959; 1961; 1962...)

Josh Cuf 9-8-07

SF

(1961)

6 yrs
Kuros: 1958-64

Morris 1974

17 yrs

1964-67 } 5 yrs
67-69 }
69-75 6 yrs

Egbal

4 yrs

DN 1978

no mention of Dr. Hase
or nuclear

(but, Nov Cult.

5 yrs

Mountain

Cuba

Hase: 1983

Not see/Born/Kid

What else didn't I know?

I know: Quincy (1964?)

(note: I didn't know Cuba, or RFR, from ECL

(I did know Dr. Hase / JFR)

(if you happen to be around...

(1964 - China / India

de-brief

1961 - JFR / news / French

any, MHH

1963 - McG on French

take

1962 - C-#

found

On Bush II + Iran "He's too crazy - even for Bush guy"

No.

(or, "He's too smart for that")

"Are you saying, I'd be evil?"

(Not by the lights; but

different morality

you (not I) are a

(any kind can get you

conspiracy theorist

to do evil

(paranoia)

- except for, Hase?

you don't
allow

no: chance

no: good intentions

(yes?)

(see Orwell...

Abstract

Links: - Empire / distant expectation / intervention

①

(as basis of strong force,
a support of force)

to FU

(NUA '49)

Chosin Res.?

(degree of big surrounded)

Why were we in
North Korea?

Colonial power: small warships,
for big ^{some ships} but big tree

(Conty
Pygmy)

(land Orient)

(no middle)

DBP

Kde bank

+ "entitled"

Quarry

do-grades!

②

FU (vs. Sau?)

and esc / FS

(Now: ~~same~~ need to neutralize)

TW for WMDs

esp. nuco

(WMDs)

blanket / control - relief

"manage relief"

"It's a slow cover"

"Not, out of (am) central"

not, unidirectional

(is anything?)

But it out... bounded it...

(Deletion of Control - Degree of Threat)

Overpowering...

USE -

(Higher Power under)

Threats

Force in the...

Purpose of news

inc. street news - not Type I Det

(OK advertised - what was
not, nothing)

(HAK around point —

level to use rules, the ("CW")

except as Modem, out of context

(Can't have "rules of CW" — as
HAK ~~is~~ imagined)

(But : US FU/FS was more prolonged
than above / was not to get...

9-8-7

I left out of Roots

By endorsing ^{Bent's} B's "option"

Candidates by endorsing the whole set
of policy papers
(which include encl. of threat

fr: Huich's papers (put in before
sent to JH:)

and, they are giving him green light
supposedly to begin
actually, to attack

Dem If one vote from
for real attractions to
attack - to avoid from bomb!

where is Roots on Real
drive?
Some place - Approving?
Final

as in fall 2002

(If don't want blame for being
hard in back

if he doesn't attack
and for gets Bomb
(General will not
forgive the! ?

just like Terrell
frag

Hendley:

[I oppose ^{Nina} Tannenbaum: "Now, there's a powerful
taboo against using the — people won't
want the.

& MCD:

"We have no military (?)

use can to deter them

use

(Short is behind the

same way, & it does;

WATO, BERLIN...

Hendley: Opposite — it works it ^{Asper} loosen
to put the for symbolic purposes.

(NO — no tabu)

NT is wrong

Hendley: What changed between 1980 + now?

Political: SU become R

Horbacher

H: Prog. toward abolition (?) begins progress
toward peace. (NO — progress is moving
much longer.)

[BUT: are we closer to abolition than
in 1987? NO!

Loss of Horbacher

Loss of Book I

even, further from
use — threat
exemption

(come in 1991 → about
done;
SACD

(We need another Horbacher

in R or US (better, but harder)

problem

(^{Good} Change across Horbacher, before distinction of CP

(WAS THAT GOOD?

Like? BAATH?!)

analogous language problem? [rape; harassment, abuse] empire
(in theory) (genocide?)

I need a sub-category of "use" for attack
Effect of US ^{attacking} miss in Iran?

since I want to broaden meaning of "use" (Humans are unique in creating structures that
advances their interests. (arts?)

Dan Lyons Show

(Quoting McN: wrong for his bill
legit use (?)
"only to defend"
in C-II? for SU?

for US of
SU "and"?

(Type I Det" means the function of
"promoting democracy"
and "fighting terrorism" } for Bush II!

A cover, national

(any FS "improvement" can be permitted (as to
participants, i.e. corps, RAND, USAF)
as "2d-stage D-L" (AJM)
or "better" Type I Det" (destroying what
appearing elite
"moral values":
this control
this one
both, ignoring "stress" on
Type I Det.

See Bush: Counter-productive b) prompt cap.
(SU must know, if
it attempts FS)

IS BUSH SINCERE?
WE MIGHT BE!
Even Wolff

Handly: Democracy is not correlated with
moderately nuclear policy!

Democracies US, F, UK (above, R) India, Israel

[Democracies (+ other?) fall in line with arms
possession when the test!

(Though ^{not} democracy (i.e. Cabinet) could block
getting democracy...)

[Who said: "I didn't know — would fall in
line with —"
Y

Carte? Y - Cruise missiles?
X - USAF?

(Lesser evils, compromises:

More: Midgerton + (only 100 MX)

McN: small ABM (McN line?)

(300,000 (not 600K, not;
controlled basis (NOT...))

N: 50% in cities, 50% in rural areas, NVA in NVN
US AIR

US ground troops in US; US AIR

Rogge: (New-free world does not require
a paradigm change.) (NO)

Handly: No - peace first

Long: Palestine/Israel

——— Control of ME (oil)

(Berlin settled:

Israel - didn't

Korras

X India - Pak Kashmir (yes)

Handly: also, not to prevent
arms in Iran! (yes - explain)

9-9-07

We must have

1. US leadership (Lachy Houbrocker)
or at least,
not opposition
AS NOW (real policy) Can any other state leader/role
substitute?

Perhaps best hope: Various good things - but
backed by power: against US, not much leading
Europe? (Germany? France?)
China?

2. Norm (NEU agreed "US" (broad)
moment toward threat

Obstacles always: 1) US "det"

US-China policy is new
and as real, non-hypocritical
as its China policy on democracy in TW
(tentative)
empire

X ^{+ modern, public} US is the adversary
(not only! the potential hope!)

We Americans
must stop back:
We can't say:
"We're taking
care of it,"
wait till we
have better
action."

(Cabrero: US disagrees, ^{with} rejects, and setting appears
and now: Russia all (?) our primary objectives
(China)
Israel (A/PAC)

9-9-7

Political
Successes of new program

? Huntley North Korea

(Prussia/Pole?)

(UK?
F?)

Poland:

DBP

1972 offensive

1969-75:

Others

(Others:

on equities
~ 1973?)

(But? no

threat by

US?

China det.

Lesson of dog: put areas on ground left
to be improved

How would world be different with no news, even?

Israel:
1973

^{West}
No Berlin in divided Germany

(No divided Germany?) arming of West Germany?

No divided VN after 1956

(Reconstruction of Germany
after Marshall Plan*)

CW on Israel

in 1991?

on US?

SU/Russia in northern Iran? PG?

SU/Russia in ME/Persian Gulf: presence
and player

(Israel: less secure in S-E, since 1967)

China in Qiang, Motan (so?)
in Taiwan?

* Note: Marshall Plan was not adequate;

Was it the main factor in reconstruction
of Europe?

What did this in Japan?

TR
Lander

(Have lead to US (pop? camps?))

is frag- from friendship (alliance?)

(Bank opened possible

→ Coop. with? China?
Russia?

(We haven't talked out — till — US ABMs in Europe

Nikolai

"Q: Who in West decides on ABM

ASM help ~~FS~~ FS Cap.

But many: profits

"Will US return to producing IRBMs if INF goes!"

(in reference to US ABMs)

(INF) 1987 eliminated

2692 ^{US TOP?} minerals (4000 warheads)

1846 " SU

USA 846

SS-5 Tested in 1960

w. real warhead 1963 (after C-II)

1 - 2.3 MT warhead

C & opposed (N-bomb missiles (?) (not active: ASM
Perish " potential
testis " MX/SS-18 missiles

1988-2001

1116 inspiration

20,000 experts

↑
all endangered

(USG/elite is not "indifferent" to NEU
"other priorities" — uninterested, dismissive
"processed elsewhere"
like anti-war, and central movement

dominant interests
USA has always been against — abolition — opposed in principle + practice
It would not favor a universal enforceable — real CTB (see formal)
agreement; abolition is not just "feasibility" (of this) or
no restraint on Israel opposition of non-proliferation
or US other: USG about
is (one of the) security
pretensions

Global warming?

see "am" MIC (≈ US to good approx)
US Tobacco corp. globally

universal NP
(broad...
NEU

real, stabilizing and central

Min det
anti-alent
anti-D-L
protection
cheap.

(We Americans should not be apologists or defenders
(or haters? "anti-American"?)

not against our Bill of Rights

USG "priority of goals
is an ideological policy

(and ruthlessness, indifference
is like that of Philip Morris
asbestos manufacturing

(Pharma — with a bad product

I MUST STOP SAYING "WE"

we're (USG) worse

(as if people like me actually had political influence [?])

Krign to Nikitin:

→ What does it take to save the INF Treaty?

CTB

mount ABM

(not in Europe:

/
how dangerous is the
program

Would we be

(in 1995, on NPT

[McN may have seen Problem like Harbours -
see, E JFK / little focus
CBS " "

no (?) effort to change fundamental policy
(in NATO? place MIC with non-muc
armament.)

Wf cost / couldn't we live without arms in the world?

(ME? We don't need the now?)

But if we'd against "threat" of SU rising

Now - 1) for future reversal or to clashes effort in the region...

2) global entire (Wf not have the?)

3) lack of SU

Wf don't US and a "legislation"?

Because US wants to reestablish interference
on ground in regions next to states with large ground forces
in or

[Should I say "we" for USG?]

anti-arm energy, yes

Has anti-arm movement ever been a youth movement,
a large movement?

What fraction of IM in Central Park in 1982?

or now: anti-frag

anti-frag (no movement)

though: anti-globalization yes

global warning / environment

Could US states be permanently, in interests of
non-proliferation, to do without EU / the arms,
and lower, with any but non det states forces
(China vs. US)

Clinton
(+ neo-cons
from 1993)

Hansen (4) underground states: (and, as of 1991 - frag

Pimpston: from C3, WMDs

(Now: from?)

other getting on equation

for future mission

6) Karp Kalos operation

(5) "Data BW" (CW?) Bebis, unexamined

(McN will say anything that seems

Sade

To Jessica Willbanks

- "Atheists/agnostics/"spiritual not religious"

have very strong moral instincts, motives
(see Parin; Ikoreau (Hondhi?)

later

but they don't wear them on their sleeve,
or explain their power or content (perhaps
different from
religions?)

they disagree with
content of religious
morals
and use words of
them

or use language of morality

* "we" don't
have churches,
priests, bishops
schools/universities

however, they repeal religions
and don't try to collab./have coalition
with religious people

(who dogmatically recognize NO
basis for morals except
divine authority, Bible/Koran etc /

priests / and belief in hell / heaven

WHO AGREE NOT ONLY ON "ISSUES" BUT ON
MANY! MORAL CONCERNS

afterlife (Koran)

(though belief in afterlife, but

not in heaven, hell, Koran; or, reincarnation...

(ghosts; animism

(we

NUCS; S.B. § (Caths); TORTURE; AGGRESSION (UNJUST WAR); TERRORISM

⑤ The turning-point / threshold for events
was not Hiroshima / Nagasaki:
(earlier:

+ S.B.
It was creation of unes:
MP-I
Trinity

~~that~~

from then on:

|| How and when would be difficult
if no H+N? Hiroshima / Nag.

(If turning point "used" — a difference...

World agreement between US, Russia, UK (France)
Have been more attainable?

^{applic...}
(Comment: less available
Wrong or right?

Would Ulan / Teller have happened, or happened
much later, if hst had not made decision
of 1950, but had followed GAO? Did hst
affect H-bomb development?

Would Enrichment-Rohr proposal have stood
up after Ulan-Teller "secret" decision?

Rondas to me:

1978 (he was commanding a frigate in
Bay of Bengal - listened in to pilots)

The US ("we") is a rogue state / super power

We do not "make laws"
define "right"

Is Type I OK immoral? (Peter Weiss)

(Possession; base)

for

Is Type II - FS/FS? vs. overwhelming conventional
attack/threat

depends on scale/consequences of

e.g. for Israel?

OK?

For example: 1972, Oct 12, UK

- to save many (more) lives: (US & Japan)

Time May 1985

Ripon 1985

if an invasion is otherwise necessary

But in this case "necessity" that US requires
(Japan - could have been there!)

Jan
(Powers: did accept S.B.)

- to prevent US or unofficially born from
getting ruined

that might well

e.g. Pakistan after Musharraf!

Does US (commit) empire regime mess?

Neo-cons: 1992 (Wolf/Chen...

we want (must have?)

no regional rivals, dangerous

esp. in ME

(make)

(are our mess really necessary for this?)

Do they help?

We can't prevent — though we wish we
could — regional countries from getting mess

(to date:
to date)

(Aren't we here at point of anti-alcohol
forces in 1933)

Could Hernandez lead a movement?

(Should Left could have changed
Pever

ME —

Sharon
tell 2nd wife (year?)

We're likely Israel during Lebanon attack?

being in

as, in UK during Falklands

me: What's a new approach?

(Enrica
TDA: for a new incident
(but if it's US)
promising

1) If it's not new, it has failed,
repeatedly?

("Mandates - keeping doing the

Who will bell the cat?

Who can well influence US?

2) We Americans can't do it -

and around

A joint power not needed to use EU
to US umbrella

3) So - a NWS must renounce nuclear tests
nuclear

or (more likely) a NNWS under US
umbrella must renounce umbrella

and nuclear weapons: OR A MOVEMENT
WITHIN NNWS

NV

Power

nuclear;

not just nuclear

CD...

(united: Berlin)

(Latin: Libya)

Japan

now: GERMANY

"We renounce nuclear tests and nuclear umbrella

NOT ENOUGH TO SAY
Nuclear test are should do



(not just:

4) Leaders who say (China) This is crazy + evil

(used-up: Horvath?

Center?

Mandela - got

(category forbidden to

Horvath, but moving from us into alt. energy

Is Type I OK immoral? (Peter Weiss)
(Possession; base)

for

Is Type II - FS/FS? vs. overwhelming countries
attack/threat

depends on scale/correspondence of

e.g. for Israel?

Post?

- to save many (more) lives: (US + Japan)

Time Mag. and
Nixon 1985

if an invasion is attained necessary

(Japan - could have been there!

Tom
(Powers: did accept S.B.

- to prevent \$ or unfairly power from
getting ruined

that might pull

e.g. Pakistan after Musharraf!

~~Steve~~ Shefferson

Since 1997 (Clinton 2nd term :

ending of bipolarity

(? India-Pak tests in 1998 ...)

(Really? wasn't there bipolarity — of int'l after
1995

(as in India)

Alvin Slater: In 1996, US refused
to close by

For Convention in 1996, Dec 12 UN

115 for

22 against (US, some NATO UK? Hungary?)

int. "law"
But is there an int. "norm" that US opposes
and violates "on principle"

~~Big~~ (see Hong?)

Merely isolating US on this doesn't change it on
this: a core commitment of US

like: NATO EU

Type I det

Umbrella? EU (if also announced
it — Japan

and "defense" of Israel
(EU)

Hungary
(third?)

Can't deligitimate EU/powers in ME with Israel

US new cover: More EU is necessary to deter CW/BW
SU
(like, Arabs v. Israel

We've lost?

9-9-07

+ movement

US' / MLK on South
Libe de Gaulle
on Algeria!

* We don't have Security - now is needed

a movement in US

capable to or anti-VN
Civil Rights

or has to happen (Gorbachev)

Mandela / at
Pretoria

ANTI-TESTING
(or ANTI-ABM?)

It will probably We'll losing

(Did we ever have a chance?)

under Gorbachev

Regime? (if not committed
to ABM)

Book II (strategic)

There is:

Carberra

Int. Consensus (minus NATO)

McCoy: "Muddled" along is as long as others

Climate change

Revers

Ans
Controller

[Preserving the NPT is not a feasible strategy

(see 1998)

CTB - simulation

from

(9-11)

McCoy: An central view: Mutually Assured Paralysis

(US has always approved Ant. II in principle -

gestures of reduction are

no more intended to be a "stop toward

abolition" with desire/openness to further

steps - THAN US WANTS FULL EXTRICATION FROM IRAQ
OR ISRAEL FROM

Is abolition a desire of any NWS?

Andis? (

Desire, radical
reduction or
de-alerting?

Pol (no

total no

US no

UK no (why?

F no?

Russia no

Not just "N

Note (just) a feasibility question ("We all want... peace")

Ramos to me:

With India deal, NPT is dead
(India/Pak/NK testing (+ Israel